

[4th February 1925]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ The answer given to this question is “ Excepting two cases where a small reward was given to persons who volunteered to accompany the troops, etc., the Government gave no grants of land or money to any such persons.” There is no reference made to those persons who volunteered their services. Is the hon. Member in a position to say who those persons were ? ”

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—“ They were private persons who accompanied the troops during the operations in connexion with the Mappilla rebellion.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ Can the hon. the Home Member give us some idea as to the amount of money which was given by way of rewards ? ”

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—“ I am afraid I must have notice of that question if I am to give the correct information.”

Acts.

Committee on the amendment of the Madras Estates Land Act I of 1908.

* 45 Q.—Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) at what stage the work of the Committee appointed to go into the question of amending the Madras Estates Land Act I of 1908 is ;

(b) who the members of that Committee are ;

(c) what interest each of the said members represents ;

(d) whether it is a fact that the landholders' interest is more strongly represented in that body ;

(e) who are the members in it who are expected to represent the tenants' interests ;

(f) how many meetings the committee held up to the date of answering this question ;

(g) what questions were decided in those meetings ; and

(h) when Government expect this Committee to finish its labours ?

A.—(a), (f), (g) & (h) The Committee has held two sittings till now. It cannot be said now when it will finish its labours.

(b) The hon. Member is referred to G.O. No. 1917, Law (General), dated the 27th June 1924, and G.O. No. 2441, Law (General), dated the 28th August 1924, both of which have been placed on the Editors' Table. At the instance of the Committee, the following Deputy Collectors have been co-opted as members :—

M.R.Ry. M. Narasimham Pantulu Garu.

M.R.Ry. N. Koil Pillai Avargal.

(c), (d) & (e) The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to question No. 367 asked at the meeting of the Council held in August 1924.

Recognition of Canon Law under the Madras Civil Courts Bill.

* 46 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to place before the Council the correspondence between the Madras Government and the Government of India on my amendment regarding the

4th February 1925]

recognition of Canon Law like Hindu and Muhammadan law under the Madras Civil Courts Bill, or at least the opinion of this Government and the Government of India on the proposed amendment with the reasons therefor?

A.—No.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ Will not the Government be pleased to publish the correspondence between them and the Government of India ? ”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ We are not entitled to publish the correspondence between us and the Government of India unless the latter allow us to do so.”

Advisory Committees.

Joint Advisory Committees.

* 47 Q.—Rao Bahadur CRUZ FERNANDEZ : Will the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the reasons why no joint advisory committees of the Council have yet been constituted for the administration of all departments under the charge of the hon. the Revenue and the Law Members; and

(b) whether it is the intention of Government to arrange for the formation of such advisory committees with suitable provisions for the representation of minority communities from the Legislative Council, viz., Indian Christians, Muhammadans, depressed classes, Europeans, Anglo-Indians?

A.—(a) The Law Member and the Revenue Member have not till now felt the necessity for the committees.

(b) It is not the intention of the Government to constitute such committees for the departments in charge of the Law Member and the Revenue Member.

Criminal Justice.

Disturbances at Maruthakudi.

* 48 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the troubles that arose at Maruthakudi on the 13th to 15th of November over the question of the route by which a corpse was to be carried to the cremation ground;

(b) whether he has caused any inquiries to be instituted into this matter; and

(c) whether he will be pleased to place the results of the inquiry on the table of this House?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government have perused the report of the District Magistrate, Tanjore.

(c) The Government have issued an order that the prohibitory order issued under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, should remain in force till 15th May 1925; within this period the residents of Maruthakudi village will have time to take the matter to the Civil Court, if so advised.